

Decision 10-10-015 October 14, 2010

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Refinements to and Further Development of the Commission's Resource Adequacy Requirements Program.

Rulemaking 05-12-013  
(Filed December 15, 2005)

**DECISION AWARDING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO AGLET  
CONSUMER ALLIANCE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO  
DECISION 10-06-018**

<b>Claimant: Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet)</b>	<b>For contributions to Decision (D.) 10-06-018</b>
<b>Claimed: \$60,547.86</b>	<b>Awarded: \$52,413 (reduced 13%)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Mark S. Wetzell</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES****A. Brief Description of Decision:**

The decision evaluated whether the resource adequacy program is achieving the following objectives: ensuring reliability at least cost, equitably allocating the costs of reliability, supporting California's renewable energy goals and promoting competitive markets. The decision also considered whether alternatives to the current Resource Adequacy (RA) program structure could better satisfy program objectives.

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	February 3, 2006	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI):		
3. Date NOI Filed:	February 23, 2006	Yes
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes

<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.05-12-013, the instant proceeding	Yes
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 10, 2006	Yes
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.05-12-013, the instant proceeding	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 10, 2006	Yes
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.10-06-018	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	June 7, 2010	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	August 6, 2010	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

### C. Additional Comments on Part I

<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC</b>	<b>Comment</b>
X		The Commission has previously awarded Aglet compensation in this proceeding, in D.07-03-011 and D.08-04-034. The hours and expenses included in the instant compensation request do not duplicate hours and expenses in the Aglet requests that led to the two previous decisions.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**

**A. Claimant’s description of its claimed contribution to the final decision**

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Citation to Decision or Record</b>	<b>Showing Accepted by CPUC</b>
<p>1. <u>Opt-Out</u>. Aglet argued, “If an LSE [load serving entity] is allowed to opt out of the RA program for a given year and the Commission decides to increase the RA procurement goal during that year, then the cost of any incremental procurement will be borne by the customers of LSEs and IOUs who have not opted out. In this case, LSE’s who have opted out of the program in a given year will receive the incremental benefits of additional procurement, but will not be required to pay the incremental costs.” (Aglet Consumer Alliance Pre-Workshop Reply Comments on Track 2 Proposals, July 13, 2007, p. 1.)</p> <p>The Commission found, “Once a resource has been committed under the CAM [capacity auction mechanism], the reliability need that gave rise to CAM procurement in the first place has been filled, and any future opt-outs would lead to over-procurement for the system and stranded costs for the IOUs and their customers.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 79, Finding of Fact 18.)</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 79, Finding of Fact 18.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2. <u>Centralized Capacity Market</u>. Aglet proposed the establishment of a voluntary, physical call option market (PCOM) as an alternative to a centralized capacity market. (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 42.) Since Aglet’s PCOM proposal combines exchange-executed trades with bilateral contract settlement, it is similar to the Commission’s preference for bilateral</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 3; D.10-06-018, slip op. at 42; D.10-06-018, slip op. at 77, Finding of Fact 5.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>trading combined with a bulletin board and appropriate public disclosure.</p> <p>The Commission stated that “maintaining the current bilateral contracting approach best meets the [RA] program objectives at this time.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 3.)</p> <p>The Commission found, “An electronic bulletin board or equivalent mechanism with appropriate public disclosure of price and trading information would facilitate trading and promote greater liquidity.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 77, Finding of Fact 5.)</p>		
<p>3. <u>Multi-Year Forward Commitment</u>. Aglet recommended, “The Commission should require all LSEs to meet a three-year forward RA requirement.” (Aglet Consumer Alliance Proposal on Track 2 Issues, p. 2, March 30, 2007.)</p> <p>The Commission stated, “These parties argue that it is necessary to modify the program by providing for a multi-year forward commitment of capacity resources. While their concerns have merit, we conclude that a multi-year forward procurement obligation should not be adopted at this time. We direct our staff to review this issue and report its findings to us as the basis for possible future action.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 2.)</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4. <u>Backstop Mechanism</u>. Aglet recommended a backstop mechanism in its proposal on Track 1 issues. (See Aglet Consumer Alliance Proposal on Track 1 Issues, pp. 12-16, January 26, 2007.)</p> <p>The Commission stated, “As we determined in Section 3.4.6.5, a weakness of the short-term bilateral resource adequacy program is the lack of a clearly defined permanent backstop procurement mechanism. We note that the CAISO anticipates updating the</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 69-70.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>ICPM [Interim Capacity Procurement Mechanism] in order to address some of its weaknesses. We believe it would be beneficial for our staff to collaborate with the CAISO in the development of the next generation of ICPM.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 69-70.)</p>		
<p>5. <u>Direct Access Metric</u>. The Commission noted that “Aglet takes issue with the metric of enabling direct access because the role of direct access is being evaluated in R.07-05-025.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 57.) Although the Commission did not eliminate the direct access metric, it stated that “certain other metrics, particularly reliability and least cost, should be given greater weight.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 58.)</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 57; D.10-06-018, slip op. at 58.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6. <u>Regulatory Authority</u>. Aglet argued, “The Commission has an obligation to ensure that rates and charges paid by IOU ratepayers are just and reasonable. The Commission must not cede its regulatory authority to a market that is not subject to some degree of Commission control.” (Aglet Consumer Alliance Proposal on Track 2 Issues, p. 18, March 30, 2007). The Commission effectively agreed with Aglet when it found, “Maintaining the current scope of Commission jurisdiction over the RA program would enable the Commission to make changes to the program going forward, both for routine program refinement and for responding to any market breakdown or other unforeseen consequences.” (D.10-06-018, slip op. at 78, Finding of Fact 13.)</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 78, Finding of Fact 13.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>7. <u>The Hybrid Market</u>. In its reply to the arguments of Constellation, Aglet argued, “Constellation’s comments on the hybrid market are beyond the scope of the proceeding. The Commission</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 15.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>should give no weight in this proceeding to Constellation’s request that the Commission accelerate further reforms to the hybrid market approach.” (Supplemental Reply Comments of Aglet Consumer Alliance on Modified Centralized Market Proposal, p. 2, October 8, 2008.)</p> <p>The Commission effectively agreed with Aglet when it stated, “Moreover, a decision to rescind the hybrid market policy is not within the scope of this proceeding.”</p> <p>(D.10-06-018, slip op. at 15.)</p>		
<p>8. <u>Errors</u>. Aglet filed comments to a proposed decision issued November 3, 2009. In its comments, Aglet sought to correct an error in the proposed decision related to the administration of the Aglet PCOM proposal. (See Comments of Aglet Consumer Alliance on Proposed Decision of ALJ Wetzell, pp. 1-2, December 2, 2009.)</p> <p>The Commission adopted the change recommended by Aglet.</p> <p>(D.10-06-018, slip op. at 42.)</p>	<p>D.10-06-018, slip op. at 42.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

**B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p><b>a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b></p> <p>Bilateral Trading Group (BTG), California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA), Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&amp;E), The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and others.</p>		<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>d. Claimant’s description of how it coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how claimant’s participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>Aglet contributed to the proceeding in a manner that did not repeat the work of other parties. Aglet represents customer interests that would otherwise be underrepresented in this proceeding. As ALJ Angela Minkin noted in her eligibility ruling for Aglet in A.98-09-003 <i>et al.</i>:</p>		<p>Yes</p>

<p>"Participation in Commission proceedings by parties representing the full range of affected interests is important. Such participation assists the Commission in ensuring that the record is fully developed and that each customer group receives adequate representation." (Ruling dated July 7, 1999, p. 3.)</p> <p>As a matter of policy, Aglet does not participate in Commission proceedings where its showing is likely to be the same as showings of other consumer representatives such as TURN or DRA. For example, Aglet did not serve testimony in Phase 3 of the long term plan proceeding, R.06-02-013, because Aglet's showing would likely have duplicated the showings of TURN and DRA.</p> <p>Aglet and TURN have been the sole active parties that represent only residential and small commercial customers. DRA was an active party, but by its charter DRA must represent the interests of all customers, not only residential and small commercial customers. Aglet made conscious efforts to avoid duplication of DRA's and TURN's work in its showing.</p> <p>Aglet had a number of meetings with other parties concerning capacity markets and alternative proposals. Aglet conferred with TURN on August 16, 2007. Aglet conferred with DRA on January 25, 2007, July 16, 2007, October 9, 2007, November 5, 2007, and November 6, 2007. Aglet conferred with CLECA on February 16, 2007, August 13, 2007, August 16, 2007, August 28, 2007, and November 9, 2007. Aglet conferred with PG&amp;E on August 7, 2007.</p> <p>Aglet consultant Jan Reid met with DRA and TURN on numerous occasions throughout the course of the proceeding.</p>	
---	--

**C. Additional Comments on Part II:**

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
B.d	X		A summary of the time spent by consultant Jan Reid on each major issue is given in Attachment 2, at the bottom of the spreadsheet. Aglet Director James Weil allocated his time to individual issues based on Reid's time because most of Weil's work was editing Aglet pleadings that Reid drafted. See Attachment 3, at the bottom of the spreadsheet.
B.d	X		Aglet participated in the BTG from October 5, 2006 to March 23, 2007.

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED**

**General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):**

<b>Claimant's explanation as to how the cost of claimant's participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through claimant's participation</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p>Aglet contributed to the proceeding in a manner that was productive and will result in benefits to ratepayers that exceed the costs of participation.</p> <p>In consolidated R.97-01-009 and Investigation 97-01-010, the Commission required intervenors seeking compensation to show that they represent interests that would otherwise be underrepresented and to present information sufficient to</p>	<p>After the disallowances and adjustment we make to Aglet's claim, the remaining hours and costs are reasonable and should</p>

<p>justify a finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed the customer's costs. (D.98-04-059, Finding of Fact 13, slip op. at 83, discussion at 31 33, as modified by D.99-02-039.) The Commission noted that assigning a dollar value to intangible benefits may be difficult.</p> <p>Aglet opposed the centralized capacity market proposals submitted by the California Forward Capacity Market Advocates (CFCMA) and other parties. Aglet estimates that ratepayers would pay \$73/kilowatt-year (kw-yr) in a centralized capacity market versus the current penalty amount of \$40/kw-yr, a difference of \$33/kw-yr. Thus, a single 5 megawatt plant would cost ratepayers approximately \$165,000 per year, or more than twice the requested award.</p> <p>The Commission can safely find that the participation of Aglet in this proceeding was productive. Overall, the benefits of Aglet's contributions to D.10-06-018 justify compensation in the amount requested.</p>	<p>be compensated.</p>
--	------------------------

**A. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
<b>ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES</b>									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
James Weil	2007	14.1	280	D.07-05-037	3,948.00	2007	13.8	280	3,864
James Weil	2008	1.4	300	D.08-05-033	420.00	2008	1.4	300	420
James Weil	2009	1.2	300	D.08-05-033 and Res. ALJ-235 <sup>1</sup>	360.00	2009	1.2	300	360
<i>Subtotal: 4,728</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$4,644</i>			
<b>EXPERT FEES</b>									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Jan Reid	2006	20.1	155	D.06-11-032	3,115.50	2006	20.1	155	3,116
Jan Reid	2007	210.4	170	D.07-05-037	35,768.00	2007	198.3	170	33,711
Jan Reid	2008	65.0	185	D.08-11-054	12,025.00	2008	43.0	185	7,955
Jan Reid	2009	8.3	185	D.09-11-028 and Res. ALJ-235	1,535.50	2009	8.3	185	1,536
Jan Reid	2010	1.6	185	D.09-11-028 and Res. ALJ-247 <sup>2</sup>	296.00	2010	1.6	185	296
<i>Subtotal: \$52,740</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$46,614</i>			
<b>OTHER FEES: Travel</b>									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$

<sup>1</sup> Res. ALJ-235 disallows cost-of living (COLA) increases for 2009 intervenor work.

<sup>2</sup> Res. ALJ-247 disallows COLA increases for 2010 intervenor work.

Jan Reid	2006	8.0	77.50	D.06-11-032	620.00	2006	-0-	77.50	-0-
Jan Reid	2007	5.3	85	D.07-05-037	450.50	2007	-0-	85	-0-
<b>Subtotal: \$1,070.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: -0-</b>			
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>									
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Jan Reid	2010	10.1	92.50	D.08-11-054	934.25	2010	4.1	92.50	379.25
James Weil	2010	4.4	150	D.08-05-033	660.00	2010	4.4	150	660.00
<b>Subtotal: 1,594.25</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,039.25</b>			
<b>COSTS</b>									
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>			
1	Jan Reid Travel Expense	October 5, 2006, travel from Santa Cruz to San Francisco, 166 miles at 44.5 cents/mile. Attended a BTG meeting.			73.88	-0-			
2	Jan Reid Travel Expense	October 5, 2006, parking, San Francisco. Attended a BTG meeting.			10.00	-0-			
3	Jan Reid Travel Expense	October 19, 2006, travel from Santa Cruz to San Francisco, 166 miles at 44.5 cents/mile. Attended a BTG meeting.			73.88	-0-			
4	Jan Reid Travel Expense	October 19, 2006, parking, San Francisco. Attended a BTG meeting.			10.00	-0-			
5	Jan Reid Travel Expense	March 22, 2007, travel from Santa Cruz to San Francisco, 83 miles at 44.5 cents/mile. Attended a BTG meeting.			36.94	-0-			
6	Jan Reid Travel Expense	March 22, 2007, half of parking, San Francisco. Attended a BTG meeting.			5.00	-0-			
7	Jan Reid Travel Expense	April 25, 2007, travel from Santa Cruz to San Francisco, 166 miles at 44.5 cents/mile. Attended the ED Stakeholder meeting.			73.88	-0-			
8	Jan Reid Travel Expense	April 25, 2007, parking, San Francisco. Attended the ED Stakeholder meeting.			16.00	-0-			
9	Copies	See Attachment 3			65.85	65.85			
10	Postage	See Attachment 3			49.68	49.68			
<b>Subtotal: \$415.11</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$115.53</b>			
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$60,547.86</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$52,413<sup>3</sup></b>			

<sup>3</sup> Rounded to nearest dollar amount.

We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

\*\*Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.

**B. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
Reid-2007 hours and Weil-2007 hours	We disallow 5.8 hrs of Reid’s work on Demand Response Issues, .3 hrs of Reid’s work for LCR Study, and .3 hrs of Weil’s work on Demand Response Issues. D.08-04-034 granted Aglet compensation for its work in R.05-12-013 which included these Track 1 issues. D.10-06-018 however, addressed Track 2 concerns, which excluded these issues. We also disallow .3 hrs for Reid’s work on CAISO Balancing Market, which was not designated as a Track 2 issue.
Reid-2007 hours	Aglet requests 7.5 hrs for Reid’s time spent preparing Aglet’s response to a CFCMA Motion. We find these hours excessive given the scope of the document (4 pages) and allow 5 hrs for this task. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.
Reid-2007 hours	Aglet requests .8 hrs for Reid to “re-read BTGs May pre-workshop comments.” We disallow this time as it is duplicative of Reid’s efforts which have previously been compensated.
Reid-2008 hours	Aglet requests a total of 18.7 hrs of Reid’s time spent “writing comments to Staff Report.” We find these hours excessive given the scope of the document (7 pages) filed by Aglet. We disallow 10 hours of Reid’s time spent on this task. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.
Reid-2008 hours	Aglet requests 9.5 hrs for Reid’s time spent “writing reply comments on Staff Report.” For the same reasons we list above, we find these hours excessive given the scope of the document produced (4 pages). We disallow 4.0 hrs for this task. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.
Reid-2008 hours	Aglet requests 13.3 hours for Reid’s time spent “writing supplementary comments on MCM”. We find these hours excessive given the scope of the document produced (4 pages). We disallow 8.0 hrs for this task. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.
Reid-2007 general preparation hours	Aglet requests 22 hours for Reid’s “general” preparation hours. Assumingly these are hours that Aglet it is unable to allocate to a specific issue but essential for Aglet’s participation in this proceeding. We disallow of 2.4 of Reid’s “general” hours to represent proportionately the amount of hours we have disallowed in this claim. We reduce these hours from Reid’s 2007 total to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. We make no adjustment to Weil’s time spent on “general” matters as we have made minuscule disallowances to his work.

Weil’s travel hours and costs	The Commission awards fees and expenses for reasonable travel time and does not compensate for “routine travel.” We consider travel time and costs incurred by attorneys, consultants and other experts participating in Commission proceeding to be non-compensable if the one-way travel distance is 120 miles or less. We disallow Weil’s travel hours and costs accordingly to reflect this policy. <sup>4</sup> The remainder of Aglet’s costs are reasonable commensurate with the work performed.
Intervenor Compensation Preparation	Aglet requests 14.5 hrs for preparation of its NOI and Compensation Claim. We find these hours excessive given the fact that the claim relates to only one decision. TURN, the only other intervenor in this proceeding, requested a total of 8.5 hrs for this same task. We find 8.5 hrs to be more reasonable given a task of this complexity and approve the same amount of hours for Aglet here. To achieve this allocation, we reduce Reid’s time by 6 hours. The adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

**A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim?**

No

**B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?**

Yes

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Claimant has made a substantial contribution to Decision 10-06-018.
2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The total of reasonable contribution is \$52,413.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. Claimant is awarded \$52,413.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison shall pay claimant the total award. We direct Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison to allocate payment

<sup>4</sup> See D.07-04-010 at 12 and D.09-01-034 at 12.

responsibility among themselves based upon their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2007 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning October 20, 2010, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated October 14, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY  
President  
DIAN M. GRUENEICH  
JOHN A. BOHN  
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON  
NANCY E. RYAN  
Commissioners

**APPENDIX**  
**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>	D1010015	<b>Modifies Decision?</b> No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1006018	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R0512013	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Mark S. Wetzell	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company	

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
Aglet Consumer Alliance	08-06-10	\$60,547.86	\$52,413	No	disallowance of efforts outside of the scope of the proceeding, disallowance of hours and costs related to routine travel and excessive hours.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
James	Weil	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$280	2007	\$280
James	Weil	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$300	2008-2009	\$300
Jan	Reid	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$155	2006	\$155
Jan	Reid	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$170	2007	\$170
Jan	Reid	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$185	2008-2010	\$185

**(END OF APPENDIX)**